Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/521,673	BOLZ, PETER	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Alpus H. Hsu	2619		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ster than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection E FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO	
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed form.	nsideration and/or search (see NO- w); er form for appeal by materially rec	TE below); ducing or simplifying tl		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ^o 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co		,	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 	will not be entered, or b) wil	•	-	
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-19</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a	
10.		·		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>		n condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: <u>Form PTO-892</u> .				
	/Alpus H. Hsu/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2619		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the specification was not amended accordingly in response to the proposed drawing changes.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the feature of having gateway unit including at least one microcomputer equiped with a software platform permitting an expansion of software during operation as indicated in the remark of the response after final is not persuasive since such feature is considered to be well known and convention (please see claim 3 in U.S. Patent 6,763,226 B1, col. 1, line 50 to col. 2, line 20 in U.S. Patent No. 6,779,054 B2 and col. 2, lines 6-27 in U.S. Patent No. 6,681,275 B2.